



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/696,839	10/30/2003	Sherif Yacoub	82169567	9133
22879 7590 10/19/2011 HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY Intellectual Property Administration 3404 E. Harmony Road Mail Stop 35 FORT COLLINS, CO 80528			EXAMINER ELAHEE, MD S	
			ART UNIT 2614	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 10/19/2011	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

JERRY.SHORMA@HP.COM
ipa.mail@hp.com
laura.m.clark@hp.com

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/696,839	Applicant(s) YACUB ET AL.	
	Examiner MD S. ELAHEE	Art Unit 2614	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) MD S. ELAHEE (PTO personnel). (3) ____.

(2) Richard Bell (Applicant's representative). (4) ____.

Date of Interview: 06 October 2011.

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal [copy given to: ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: ____.

Issues Discussed ☒ 101 ☐ 112 ☐ 102 ☒ 103 ☒ Others
(For each of the checked box(es) above, please describe below the issue and detailed description of the discussion)

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 16, 17, 21 and 24.

Identification of prior art discussed: Anderson.

Substance of Interview
(For each issue discussed, provide a detailed description and indicate if agreement was reached. Some topics may include: identification or clarification of a reference or a portion thereof, claim interpretation, proposed amendments, arguments of any applied references etc...)

Examiner found another good prior art reference Anderson (US7,280,651) to reject the claims limitations (see abstract; fig.4; col.2-col.10). Examiner suggested the applicant's representative to incorporate determining step of claim 7 along with limitations of claim 12 in claim 1 to make the claim 1 allowable. Similar changes need to be made in all of other independent claims in order to allow the case. The applicant's representative suggested the examiner to generate new action so that the applicant can review the action and consider the suggested incorporation to make the case allowable.

Applicant recodation instructions: It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of interview.

Examiner recodation instructions: Examiners must summarize the substance of any interview of record. A complete and proper recodation of the substance of an interview should include the items listed in MPEP 713.04 for complete and proper recodation including the identification of the general thrust of each argument or issue discussed, a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed regarding patentability and the general results or outcome of the interview, to include an indication as to whether or not agreement was reached on the issues raised.

☐ Attachment

/MD S ELAHEE/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2614	
--	--